Water Plan Update

Objectives Web-a-thon

Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently

June 13, 2013

MEETING SUMMARY

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN UPDATE 2013
EXPAND CONJUNCTIVE MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE
10:00 – 11:00 A.M.
815 S STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA

Meeting Objectives

Discuss and suggest revisions for the Related Actions associated with the Update 2013 Objective relating to Water Use Efficiency (WUE):

> "Use water more efficiently with significantly greater water conservation, recycling, and reuse to help meet future water demands and adapt to climate change."

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

The Update 2013 Objectives Web-a-thon was held on June13-14, 2013 to discuss the draft 17 Objectives and the associated Related Action for the Water Plan. Introductions were made around the room and online. Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Manager, Statewide Integrated Water Management Branch, welcomed everyone and noted that an online wrap up session will be conducted on July 9th, to conclude any items needing additional discussion. He explained that the workbook was prepared by DWR staff and subject matter experts, and is for discussion purposes only. The first few pages of this draft document provide definitions of terms and the Water Plan mission, vision and goals – which sets the context for the objectives and related actions. A brief review of the Water Use Efficiency objective and related actions (found on pages 4-5 of the workbook) would be followed by discussion on the text.

Overview

Jose Alarcon, DWR Project Team, provided brief background on how the objectives and related actions were developed. He and Francisco Guzman have reviewed the 37 Featured State Plans, related state agency plans with bearing on the Water Plan, and correlated the respective recommendations with the Water Plan objectives. These were forwarded to the subject matter experts for consideration in updating the related actions for each objective. Collectively, the objectives identify what is needed to accomplish the goals of the Water Plan. The related actions represent what is needed to accomplish each particular objective.

The workbook contains a column for performance measures, which will help track each action and inform the next Water Plan Progress Report. Draft measures have been proposed for some of the objectives, and feedback is welcomed on potential performance measures – as well as the objectives and related actions.

Document Walk Through

Peter Brostrom, DWR, Water Use and Efficiency, reviewed the Water Use Efficiency Objective. He noted that eight related actions have been proposed. Suggested edits or additions are welcome to the initial proposal.

Related Actions

The proposed Related Actions, and the ensuing discussion, are presented below. Please note that the actions below have been abridged from the original text and the sub-actions are not included:

General Discussion

- Regarding the concept of "losses," it's important to realize that the hydrologic cycle doesn't work exactly the way it's described. It does actually disappear through evaporation, it's not transferred 100%. Water does not move perfectly from one place to another – even evaporation goes into other areas (water agencies). Feels objective 7 needs to stay in for this reason – if it leaks out of system, it wastes energy, climate, etc. and need to keep this goal in.
- Consider adding an action relating to water rate structure and conservation-based pricing.

1. The State should expand the "Save Our Water" campaign to better inform all Californians on the importance and value of water and on ways to use water more efficiently. The expanded campaign should be designed with specific informational goals and objectives and should operate on a continuous basis in wet years as well as dry years. This campaign will assist local water suppliers and the State in achieving the 2020 water use targets.

   Discussion:

   - Can't quantify "widely." Wet versus dry is as important as landscape versus agriculture water use. Save our water campaign should focus on landscape water use efficiencies.

2. The State should support on annual basis a series of regional and crop specific water management workshops in cooperation with California academic institutions such as the University of California and California State University. The workshops should provide growers the latest information on new irrigation technology and practices.

   Discussion:

   - Expand this.

3. DWR, with the SWRCB and CDPH, should prepare a comprehensive review and report of regional recycled water conditions to guide expanded statewide use of recycled water and its improved integration into the state's water portfolio. This will include regional assessments and regional strategies to address statewide water challenges, including findings from the 2003 Recycled Water Task Force. Regional assessments will include: quantification of current and proposed recycled water capacities and demands; assessing a 'fit for purpose' concept for urban, agricultural and environmental applications; and evaluating barriers to additional recycled water use and proposing solutions, including indirect and direct potable reuse issues.

   Discussion:

   - This is duplicative in the water management plan and hydro region water plans. Much of this is already done in resource management strategy volume.

4. The State should establish a water use efficiency and alternative supply research program to speed the development, testing and implementation of promising new technology and approaches to water management. The program should conduct studies in all sectors of water use including agriculture, municipal and industrial and in the alternative supply areas of recycling, greywater, storm water capture and desalination. The level of sponsored research should match that of the State's energy use efficiency research programs.

   Discussion:

   - Ag is different from urban in terms of range – perhaps research can focus on better water measurement devices for ag. DWR could start measuring and publishing evaporation across the state – the technology is there to do this. Publication of this would aid irrigation districts in managing water use efficiency. Remote sensors – related to specific crops is another idea.

5. DWR should develop urban water supplier efficiency. The efficiency metrics should be developed so that if additional water use reductions are required beyond 2020, the metrics could be used to assign water use targets. The metrics should account for the climate, landscape area and the level of commercial, industrial and institutional water use in a supplier's service area.

   Discussion:

   - This one is extremely difficult (political language) and probably water community would have trouble contributing to this – they are likely to oppose. Efficiency measures are tough and are too difficult to quantify. Evaporation transpiration is a use, not a loss. Packing house washwater is a loss – can't dispose.
   - Say: "State government should work with stakeholders to develop…"
   - Delete the second sentence.

6. DWR, in cooperation with urban water use community, should conduct a study to identify the barriers, costs and technical assistance required to establish standard urban water use classifications for water use reporting. The standard classifications would allow for water supplier data to be more accurately aggregated at the regional and statewide levels and permit a more detailed and accurate reporting of California water use.

   Discussion:

   - This should be done before #5. Water community can work with this one and potentially combine with #5. The responsible party should be changed to: "State government should work with stakeholders to develop…"

7. Agricultural and urban water suppliers should report water supply system losses in their water management plans. Agricultural suppliers should measure and report canal seepage and district outflows. Urban water suppliers should calculate and report distribution system losses.

   Discussion:

   - 2005 update: water can't be created or destroyed. System loss is used by something else. Need to think about where water goes as it doesn't disappear. "Losses" should be changed or put in quotes. Most of the reporting will require this.
   - Urban water management plans have always included water losses.
   - Some clarification over what system losses actually means…Boundaries of the system needs to be defined.
   - Online: But loses in urban areas is likely to degraded basins that will render the lose polluted. This is not only a water efficiency issues but also an energy efficiency

8. All levels of government should establish policies and provide incentives to promote better urban runoff management and reuse. Urban and, where feasible, rural communities should invest in facilities to capture, store, treat and use urban storm water runoff, such as percolation to usable aquifers, underground storage beneath parks, small surface basins, in drains, or the creation of catch basins or sumps downhill of development. Depending on the source and application captured storm water may be suitable for use without additional treatment, or it may be blended to augment local supplies.

   Discussion:

   - In MWD's service area stormwater is captured but not usually reported as it goes into groundwater, but have to report groundwater production so it would be double counting? This could be clarified and organized better.

- Add "within environmental constraints."
- Strongly support development of incentives at all levels of government. Suggest a separate performance measure for this - to identify specific incentives implemented. LID principles and techniques are required in municipal separate storm water permits across the state for the past 5 years and more now in other areas. Suggest performance measure to include an assessment of how codes, ordinances and building standards with clear nexus to General Plans. One comment on the issue of a solely a sump at the bottom of a development - this may not be as consistent with LID principles maintaining hydrologic cycle if you're talking of a large drainage area. A combination of distributed onsite infiltration systems. Suggest as performance measure.

Attendance

In-Room

Rebecca Crebbin-Coates, Planning and Conservation League
Karl Longley, California Water Institute, UC Fresno
Bob Siegfried, Carmel Area Wastewater District

Jose Alarcon, DWR, Water Quality Lead
Manucher Alemi, DWR, Water Use and Efficiency Branch Chief
Peter Brostrom, DWR, Water Use and Efficiency
Megan Fidell, DWR, RMS Coordinator, Progress Report Lead
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Manager, Statewide Integrated Water Management
Francisco Guzman, DWR, Companion Plans and Objectives Lead
Rich Juricich, DWR, Data and Analysis Lead
Paul Massera, DWR, Water Plan Program Manager
Rich Mills, DWR, Water Recycling and Desalination Section Chief
Lewis Moeller, DWR, Water Plan Project Manager
Elizabeth Patterson, DWR, Land Use Lead
Maury Roos, DWR, Chief Hydrologist

Lisa Beutler, MWH, Water Plan Executive Facilitator
Heidi Hill Drum, CCP, Facilitator
Judie Talbot, CCP, Facilitator

Webinar

Angela Anderson, Bureau of Reclamation
Erika Barraza, Carollo Engineers
Marilyn Boehnke, California Department of Food and Agriculture
Dave Bolland, Association of California Water Agencies
Rick Breuer, State Water Board
Kurt Broz, Pala Tribe
Chris Brown, California Urban Water Conservation Council
Karen Buhr, California Association of Resource Conservation Districts
Celeste Cantu, Santa Ana Watershed Protection Agency
Ronnie Cohen, journalist
MaryLou Cotton, Kennedy Jenks
Jerry De La Piedra, Santa Clara Valley Water District
Anisa Divine, Imperial Irrigation District
Debbie Espe, San Diego County Water Agency
Gina Ford, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Aaron Fukuda, Tulare Irrigation District
Milasol Gaslan, Santa Ana Regional Water Board

Carol Hall, Kleinfelder
Earle Hartling, Los Angeles County Sanitation District
Jack Hawks, California Water Association
Sachiko Itagaki, Kennedy Jenks
Alex Kim, UC Irvine
Kathy Mannion, Regional Council of Rural Counties
Ari Michelson, UC Santa Barbara
Margie Namba, Granite Construction
Mark Norton, Santa Ana Watershed Protection Authority
Eric Osterling, Kings River Conservation District
Jodi Pontureri, State Water Board
Laleh Rastegarzadeh, State Water Board
Sarah Rhodes, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Tracy Slavin, Bureau of Reclamation
Tony St. Amant, Water Policy Advocate
Sergio Vargas, Ventura County Watershed Protection District
Mike Wade, California Farm Water Coalition
Marsha Westropp, Orange County Water District
Emilia Wisniewski, East Bay Municipal Utility District
Betty Yee, Central Valley Regional Water Board
Mary Zauner, Los Angeles County Sanitation District

Curtis Anderson, DWR, Northern Region Office Chief
Carmel Brown, DWR, Executive Assistant, Integrated Water Management
Abby Carevic, DWR, Northern Region Office, Water Supply Evaluations
Kent Frame, DWR, Water Use and Efficiency
Nancy King, DWR, Water Recycling and Desalination
John Kirk, DWR, South-Central Region Office, Groundwater Section
Nancy Miller, DWR, Water Recycling and Desalination
Salomon Miranda, DWR, Floodplain Management
Toni Pezzetti, DWR, Water Recycling and Desalination
Betsy Vail, DWR, Urban Water Use and Efficiency
Terri Wegener, DWR, Manager, Statewide Flood Management